

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 25, 2011 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found in at least paragraph [036] of the subject application. Claims 1-14 and 16-30 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Further examination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Giroti (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034723) and Girard (U.S. Patent No. 7,283,519).

Giroti pertains to a converged conferencing appliance that enables remote and local participants to connect to one another using disparate devices and for establishing and managing concurrent voice, data and video conferencing sessions initiated by one or more such devices over heterogeneous networks. See Giroti at paragraph [0003].

However, Giroti does not disclose, either expressly or implicitly, that “the endpoint address information is automatically obtained at same time that the multimedia collaboration system automatically attempts to connect to the at least one client device and the associated endpoint” (emphasis added). See claim 1.

Rather, paragraph [0097] of Giroti describes that each participant creates his or her own personal profile from the user registration screen 260 and enters information such as name/password 261, phone number 262, email address 263, personal digital assistant information 264, primary notification method 264, account information 266, and other similar personal information. Once registered, the participant is available to be scheduled in a conference by others.

Furthermore, paragraphs [0089] to [0094] of Giroti describe how to (1) initiate a voice conferencing session independent of the data session, (2) initiate a data conferencing session independent of the voice session, and (3) initiate a Voice over Internet Protocol (IP) session independent of other sessions.

Moreover, the Office Action alleged that in Giroti, a user can simultaneously interact with both voice and data by delivering voice and data files or dynamic content over multiple devices. See Office Action at page 9, lines 17 and 18.

However, nothing was found in Giroti that discloses a multimedia collaboration system that is configured to simultaneously obtain the endpoint address information from each of the plurality of client devices and attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at the selected end point address. See claim 1.

Girard pertains to a distributed edge switching system for a voice-over-packet multiservice network. In particular, Girard describes a network device that detects network signaling events, or triggers points in a telephone call, and invokes the call processing application in response to the detected network signaling events or trigger points. See Girard at column 18, lines 8-22.

However, nothing was found in Girard to cure the deficiencies of Giroti as described above with respect to independent claim 1.

In addition, contrary to the position taken by the Office Action, nothing was found in Girard to disclose how “the plurality of endpoint addresses [of a participant’s client device are] assigned priorities.” Claim 1. Rather, Girard merely describes preferential routing policies to ensure that higher priority voice and video packets are routed in a timely fashion. Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably interpret Girard to teach prioritizing packets for routing with assigning priorities to a plurality of endpoint addresses of a participant’s client device.

If the Office believes to the contrary, Applicants respectfully request that the Office provide an explanation how a person of ordinary skill in the art would allegedly interpret the claim language and how the disclosure in Girard is alleged to teach the claimed features. Conclusory statements are not sufficient to assert that a particular claim feature is obvious. See MPEP § 2141(III) (“rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory

statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”).

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Giroti and Girard fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-14 and 16-30 depend, either directly or indirectly, on independent claim 1 and, therefore, inherit the patentable features thereof. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Giroti and Girard also fails to disclose each and every element of dependent claims 2-14 and 16-30.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Although Applicants have focused the remarks and/or amendments on or primarily on the independent claims in order to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, Applicants reserve the right to remark on and/or amend any of the dependent claims at any time. The mere fact that Applicants have not remarked on and/or amended any of the dependent claims at this time, either related to an Official Notice or not, is unequivocally not an admission of prior art.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2011

/Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310